

SUBIDEALS OF OPERATORS II

SASMITA PATNAIK AND GARY WEISS

ABSTRACT. A subideal (also called a J -ideal) is an ideal of a $B(H)$ -ideal J . This paper is the sequel to *Subideals of Operators* where a complete characterization of principal and then finitely generated J -ideals were obtained by first generalizing the 1983 work of Fong and Radjavi who determined which principal $K(H)$ -ideals are also $B(H)$ -ideals. Here we determine which countably generated J -ideals are $B(H)$ -ideals, and in the absence of the continuum hypothesis which J -ideals with generating sets of cardinality less than the continuum are $B(H)$ -ideals. These and some other results herein are based on the dimension of a related quotient space. We use this to characterize these J -ideals and settle additional questions about subideals. A key property in our investigation turned out to be J -softness of a $B(H)$ -ideal I inside J , that is, $IJ = I$, a generalization of a recent notion of softness of $B(H)$ -ideals introduced by Kaftal-Weiss and earlier exploited for Banach spaces by Mityagin and Pietsch.

1. INTRODUCTION

In *Subideals of Operators* [8] we found three types of principal and finitely generated subideals (i.e., J -ideals): linear, real-linear and nonlinear subideals. Such types also carry over to general J -ideals. The linear $K(H)$ -ideals, being the traditional ones, were studied in 1983 by Fong and Radjavi [3]. They found principal linear $K(H)$ -ideals that are not $B(H)$ -ideals. Herein we take all J -ideals $\mathcal{I}$ to be linear, but as proved in [8], we expect here also that most of the results and methods apply to the two other types of subideals (real-linear and nonlinear). Also H , as in [8], denotes a separable infinite-dimensional complex Hilbert space. One of our main contributions in [8] was to use a modern framework for $B(H)$ -ideals to generalize [3, Theorem 2]. We generalized their result on principal $K(H)$ -ideals to all principal J -ideals by proving that a principal and then a finitely generated J -ideal $(\mathcal{S})_J$ generated by the finite set $\mathcal{S} \subset J$ is also a $B(H)$ -ideal if and only if $(\mathcal{S})$ is J -soft, that is, $(\mathcal{S}) = (\mathcal{S})J$ where $(\mathcal{S})$ is the $B(H)$ -ideal generated by $\mathcal{S}$. Then we used this to characterize the structure of $(\mathcal{S})_J$. J -softness is a generalization of a recent notion of $K(H)$ -softness of $B(H)$ -ideals introduced by Kaftal-Weiss and earlier exploited for Banach spaces by Mityagin and Pietsch (see [8, Remark 2.6], [7], [9]).

Here we further develop the subject by investigating J -ideals $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{S})_J$ generated by arbitrary sets $\mathcal{S}$ of varying cardinality, their algebraic structure and when they are $B(H)$ -ideals. To add perspective, the reader should keep in mind that all nonzero J -ideals have cardinality and Hamel dimension precisely cardinality $\mathfrak{c}$ of the continuum (Remark 3.3), but questions on the cardinalities of their possible generating sets is another matter (Section 6, Questions 1-2), and this we shall see impacts questions on structure. After investigating the cases when $\mathcal{S}$ is countable or of cardinality less than $\mathfrak{c}$ (absent the continuum hypothesis CH), we then consider general J -ideals $\mathcal{I}$ and questions on the possible cardinalities of their generating sets, observing that $\mathcal{I}$ is always a generating set for itself but may have generating sets of cardinality less than its cardinality $\mathfrak{c}$. When they do has special implications.

We show $(\mathcal{S})_J$ is a $B(H)$ -ideal if and only if $(\mathcal{S})$ is J -soft for those $(\mathcal{S})_J$ generated as a J -ideal by countable sets and then when generated by sets of cardinality strictly less than cardinality $\mathfrak{c}$ (Theorem 4.1). This will follow from sufficiency of the codimension condition on $(\mathcal{S})_J^0$ in $(\mathcal{S})_J$: $(\mathcal{S})_J/(\mathcal{S})_J^0$ has Hamel dimension strictly less than $\mathfrak{c}$. (For $(\mathcal{S})_J^0$ see Definition 2.2.) We then investigate general J -ideals to provide an example where softness fails for a J -ideal $\mathcal{I}$ with codimension of $\mathcal{I}^0$ in $\mathcal{I}$ equal to $\mathfrak{c}$ (Example 4.5), thereby showing that J -ideals that are also $B(H)$ -ideals need not be J -soft and as a consequence cannot be generated in J by sets of cardinality less than $\mathfrak{c}$. We also answer several questions on J -ideals posed in [8, Sections 6-7], provide some additional results and pose new questions.

Date: September 28, 2012.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 47L20, 47B10, 47B07; Secondary: 47B47, 47B37, 13C05, 13C12.

Key words and phrases. Ideals, operator ideals, principal ideals, subideals, lattices.

In summary the main theorems here are:

For $\mathcal{I}^0 := \text{span}\{\mathcal{I}J + J\mathcal{I}\} + J(\mathcal{I})J$ (see Definition 2.2) where $(\mathcal{I})$ is the $B(H)$ -ideal generated by J -ideal $\mathcal{I}$,

Theorem. (Theorem 4.1) *The J -ideal $(\mathcal{S})_J$ generated by a set $\mathcal{S}$ of cardinality strictly less than $\mathfrak{c}$ is a $B(H)$ -ideal if and only if the $B(H)$ -ideal $(\mathcal{S})$ is J -soft (i.e., $(\mathcal{S}) = (\mathcal{S})J$). Moreover, for a J -ideal $\mathcal{I}$ with Hamel dimension of $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^0$ strictly less than $\mathfrak{c}$, $\mathcal{I}$ is a $B(H)$ -ideal if and only if $(\mathcal{I})$ is J -soft.*

Structure Theorem. (Theorem 4.4) *For $(\mathcal{S})_J$ when $|\mathcal{S}| < \mathfrak{c}$,
The algebraic structure of the J -ideal $(\mathcal{S})_J$ generated by a set $\mathcal{S}$ is given by*

$$(\mathcal{S})_J = \text{span}\{\mathcal{S} + J\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{S}J\} + J(\mathcal{S})J$$

$J(\mathcal{S})J$ is a $B(H)$ -ideal, $\text{span}\{J\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{S}J\} + J(\mathcal{S})J$ is a J -ideal, and $J(\mathcal{S})J \subset \text{span}\{J\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{S}J\} + J(\mathcal{S})J \subset (\mathcal{S})_J$. This inclusion collapses to $J(\mathcal{S})J = (\mathcal{S})_J$ if and only if $(\mathcal{S})$ is J -soft.

Remark. *Although the methods in [3] are quite a bit more analytic, we found here and in [8] a more direct algebraic approach, albeit a key tool [4] used herein is essentially analytic.*

2. PRELIMINARIES

Recall the following standard definitions from [8] with Definition 2.2 evolving from [8].

Definition 2.1. *Let J be an ideal of $B(H)$ (i.e., a $B(H)$ -ideal) and $S \in J$.*

- *The principal $B(H)$ -ideal generated by the single operator S is given by*

$$(S) := \bigcap \{I \mid I \text{ is a } B(H)\text{-ideal containing } S\}$$

- *The principal J -ideal generated by S is given by*

$$(S)_J := \bigcap \{I \mid I \text{ is a } J\text{-ideal containing } S\}$$

- *As above for principal J -ideals, likewise for an arbitrary subset $\mathcal{S} \subset J$, $(\mathcal{S})$ and $(\mathcal{S})_J$ respectively denote the smallest $B(H)$ -ideal and the smallest J -ideal generated by the set $\mathcal{S}$. In particular, $(\mathcal{S}) = (\mathcal{S})_{B(H)}$. Denote $(\mathcal{I})$ as the $B(H)$ -ideal generated by the J -ideal $\mathcal{I}$.*

Definition 2.2. *For a J -ideal $\mathcal{I}$, the algebraic J -interior of $\mathcal{I}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{I}^0 := \text{span}\{\mathcal{I}J + J\mathcal{I}\} + J(\mathcal{I})J$ where $\mathcal{I}J := \{AB \mid A \in \mathcal{I}, B \in J\}$, $J\mathcal{I}$ is defined similarly, and the ideal product $J(\mathcal{I})J$ is the $B(H)$ -ideal given by $J(\mathcal{I})J = \{ES'F \mid E, F \in J, S' \in (\mathcal{I})\}$ (single triple operator products) where equality follows from [2, Lemma 6.3].*

Remark 2.3. *For the J -ideal $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{S})_J$ generated by a set $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{I}^0$ has the simpler form:*

$$(\mathcal{S})_J^0 = \text{span}\{\mathcal{S}J + J\mathcal{S}\} + J(\mathcal{S})J$$

Notice also that $(\mathcal{S})_J^0 \subset (\mathcal{S})_J$.

Indeed, for $\mathcal{S} = \{S_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$, $(\mathcal{S})_J = \bigcup_{\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_j\} \subset \mathcal{A}} \{(S_{\alpha_1})_J + (S_{\alpha_2})_J + \dots + (S_{\alpha_j})_J\}$ where $\mathcal{A}$ is an index set.

By definition, $(\mathcal{S})_J^0 = \text{span}\{(\mathcal{S})_J J + J(\mathcal{S})_J\} + J((\mathcal{S})_J)J$, and because $((\mathcal{S})_J) = (\mathcal{S})$ one has the simplification: $(\mathcal{S})_J^0 = \text{span}\{(\mathcal{S})_J J + J(\mathcal{S})_J\} + J(\mathcal{S})J$. The algebraic structure for principal J -ideals yields $(S_\alpha)_J = \mathbb{C}S_\alpha + JS_\alpha + S_\alpha J + J(S_\alpha)J$ for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. So $\text{span}\{(S_\alpha)_J J + J(S_\alpha)_J\} + J(S_\alpha)J \subset S_\alpha J + JS_\alpha + J(S_\alpha)J$ for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. Therefore $(\mathcal{S})_J^0 \subset \text{span}\{\mathcal{S}J + J\mathcal{S}\} + J(\mathcal{S})J$, and since the reverse inclusion is obvious, one has equality.

We recall here the definition of J -softness of $B(H)$ -ideals [8, Definition 2.5].

Definition 2.4.

For $B(H)$ -ideals I and J , the ideal I is called “ J -soft” if $IJ = I$.

Equivalently in the language of s -numbers:

For every $A \in I$, $s_n(A) = O(s_n(B)s_n(C))$ for some $B \in I, C \in J, m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Because $IJ \subset J$, only $B(H)$ -ideals that are contained in J can be J -soft.

Remark 2.5. Standard facts on $B(H)$ -ideals from [8, Remark 2.2].

(i) [2, Sections 2.8, 4.3] (see also [6, Section 4]): If I, J are $B(H)$ -ideals then the product IJ , which is both associative and commutative, is the $B(H)$ -ideal given by the characteristic set $\Sigma(IJ) = \{\xi \in c_o^* \mid \xi \leq \eta\rho \text{ for some } \eta \in \Sigma(I) \text{ and } \rho \in \Sigma(J)\}$. In abstract rings, the ideal product is defined as the class of finite sums of products of two elements, $IJ := \{\sum_{\text{finite}} a_i b_i \mid a_i \in I, b_i \in J\}$, but in $B(H)$ the next lemma shows finite sums of operator products defining IJ can be reduced to single products.

(ii) [2, Lemma 6.3] Let I and J be proper ideals of $B(H)$. If $A \in IJ$, then $A = XY$ for some $X \in I$ and $Y \in J$.

(iii) [6, Section 1] For $T \in B(H)$, $s(T)$ denotes the sequence of s -numbers of T . Then $A \in (T)$ if and only if $s(A) = O(D_m(s(T)))$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, for a $B(H)$ -ideal I , $A \in I$ if and only if $A^* \in I$ if and only if $|A| \in I$ (via the polar decomposition $A = U|A|$ and $U^*A = |A| = (A^*A)^{1/2}$), with all equivalent to $\text{diag } s(A) \in I$.

(iv) The lattice of $B(H)$ -ideals forms a commutative semiring with multiplicative identity $B(H)$. That is, the lattice is commutative and associative under ideal addition and multiplication (see [2, Section 2.8]) and it is distributive. Distributivity with multiplier $K(H)$ is stated without proof in [6, Lemma 5.6-preceding comments]. The general proof is simple and is as follows. For $B(H)$ -ideals I, J, K , one has $I, J \subset I + J := \{A + B \mid A \in I, B \in J\}$ and so $IK, JK \subset (I + J)K$, so one has $IK + JK \subset (I + J)K$. The reverse inclusion follows more simply if one invokes (ii) above: $X \in (I + J)K$ if and only if $X = (A + B)C$ for some $A \in I, B \in J, C \in K$. The lattice of $B(H)$ -ideals is not a ring because, for instance, $\{0\}$ is the only $B(H)$ -ideal with an additive inverse, namely, $\{0\}$ itself, so it is not an additive group. It is also clear that $B(H)$ is the multiplicative identity but no $B(H)$ -ideal has a multiplicative inverse.

We summarize the main results of [8] generalizing the 1983 work of Fong and Radjavi and characterizing all finitely generated linear J -ideals. Though not needed here, we note that [8] provided similar results for real-linear and nonlinear J -ideals.

Theorem 2.6. [8, Theorem 4.5] For $\mathcal{S} := \{S_1, \dots, S_N\} \subseteq J$, the following are equivalent.

(i) The finitely generated J -ideal $(\mathcal{S})_J$ is a $B(H)$ -ideal.

(ii) The $B(H)$ -ideal $(\mathcal{S})$ is J -soft, i.e., $(\mathcal{S}) = J(\mathcal{S})$ (equivalently, $(\mathcal{S}) = (\mathcal{S})J$).

(iii) For all $1 \leq j \leq N$, $S_j = \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^{n(j,k)} A_{ijk} S_k B_{ijk}$
for some $A_{ijk}, B_{ijk} \in J, n(j, k) \in \mathbb{N}$.

(iv) For all $1 \leq j \leq N$, $s(S_j) = O(D_m(s(|S_1| + \dots + |S_N|))s(T))$ for some $T \in J$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem 2.7. [8, Theorem 4.6] (Structure theorem for finitely generated J -ideal $(\mathcal{S})_J$ for $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_N\}$)
The algebraic structure of the finitely generated J -ideal $(\mathcal{S})_J$ is given by

$$(\mathcal{S})_J = \mathbb{C}S_1 + \dots + \mathbb{C}S_N + JS_1 + \dots + JS_N + S_1J + \dots + S_NJ + J(\mathcal{S})J$$

So one has

$$J(\mathcal{S})J \subseteq JS_1 + \dots + JS_N + S_1J + \dots + S_NJ + J(\mathcal{S})J \subseteq (\mathcal{S})_J \subseteq (\mathcal{S})$$

which first two, $J(\mathcal{S})J$ and $JS_1 + \dots + JS_N + S_1J + \dots + S_NJ + J(\mathcal{S})J$ respectively, are a $B(H)$ -ideal and a J -ideal. The inclusions collapse to merely

$$J(\mathcal{S})J = (\mathcal{S})_J = (\mathcal{S})$$

if and only if the finitely generated $B(H)$ -ideal $(\mathcal{S})$ is J -soft.

3. THE HAMEL DIMENSION OF IDEALS

In this section we show that the Hamel dimension and the cardinality of every nonzero J -ideal is precisely $\mathfrak{c}$. This will impact the codimension of the algebraic J -interior $\mathcal{I}^0$ in $\mathcal{I}$ and lead to questions on the possible generating sets for general J -ideals (see Question 4.3 and Section 6–Questions 1, 2, 5).

It is straightforward to see that $\mathcal{I}^0 := \text{span}\{\mathcal{I}J + J\mathcal{I}\} + J(\mathcal{I})J$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{I}$ and hence is a complex vector subspace of $\mathcal{I}$. The quotient space $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^0$ is a complex vector space and therefore has a Hamel basis where the Hamel dimension is invariant over all Hamel bases. The key notion used in our results is the Hamel dimension of $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^0$ relative to its vector space structure. ($\mathcal{I}^0$ being an ideal of $\mathcal{I}$, the quotient space $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^0$ is also a ring but we will not exploit the ring structure.)

Proposition 3.1. *For the J -ideal $(\mathcal{S})_J$ generated by a set $\mathcal{S}$ and $(\mathcal{S})_J^0 = \text{span}\{\mathcal{S}J + J\mathcal{S}\} + J(\mathcal{S})J$, the Hamel dimension of the quotient space $(\mathcal{S})_J/(\mathcal{S})_J^0$ is at most the cardinality of the generating set $\mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. From general ring theory, for $\mathcal{S} = \{S_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$, $(\mathcal{S})_J = \bigcup_{\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_j\} \subset \mathcal{A}} \{(S_{\alpha_1})_J + (S_{\alpha_2})_J + \dots + (S_{\alpha_j})_J\}$ where

$\mathcal{A}$ is an index set. Combining this with the algebraic structure for principal J -ideals implied by Theorem 2.7 (or for principal J -ideals in particular, see also [8, Proposition 4.2]), one obtains $(\mathcal{S})_J = \text{span } \mathcal{S} + (\mathcal{S})_J^0$. For $(\mathcal{S})_J^0$ being a linear subspace of $(\mathcal{S})_J$, one can show that the quotient space $(\mathcal{S})_J/(\mathcal{S})_J^0 = \text{span}\{[S_\alpha]\}$ where $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $S_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}$ and $[S_\alpha]$ denotes its quotient space coset. Therefore the Hamel dimension of the vector space $(\mathcal{S})_J/(\mathcal{S})_J^0$ is at most the cardinality of $\mathcal{S}$. $\square$

Finishing up our discussion on the Hamel dimension, the following proposition which we need in Example 4.5 is probably a well-known fact but we include it here for completeness.

Proposition 3.2. *The Hamel dimension of $F(H)$, the $B(H)$ -ideal of finite rank operators, is $\mathfrak{c}$ when H is separable (at least $\mathfrak{c}$ for H non-separable).*

Proof. Cardinal arithmetic applied to matrices when H is separable shows $|F(H)| \leq |B(H)| \leq \mathfrak{c}$, so the Hamel dimension of $F(H)$ is at most $\mathfrak{c}$. Suppose the Hamel dimension of $F(H)$ is strictly less than $\mathfrak{c}$. Let $\mathcal{B} := \{F_\alpha \in F(H) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$ be a Hamel basis for $F(H)$ with cardinality $|\mathcal{A}| < \mathfrak{c}$. Denote a finite basis for the range of F_α by B_α . So $|\bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} B_\alpha| = |\mathcal{A}|$ and from the set $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} B_\alpha \subset H$, one can extract a

maximal linearly independent set E of cardinality at most $|\mathcal{A}| < \mathfrak{c}$. Since the Hamel dimension of infinite-dimensional Hilbert space is at least $\mathfrak{c}$ [4, Lemma 3.4], there is a $0 \neq f \in H$ for which the set $E \cup \{f\}$ forms a linearly independent set. Consider the rank one operator $f \otimes f$. Since $\mathcal{B}$ is a Hamel basis for

$F(H)$, $f \otimes f = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i F_{\alpha_i}$ for some $a_i \in \mathbb{C}, n \in \mathbb{N}$. So, in particular, $f \otimes f(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i F_{\alpha_i}(f)$ which implies

$0 \neq \langle f, f \rangle f = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i F_{\alpha_i}(f) = \sum_{i=1}^m b_{\beta_i} e_{\beta_i}$ where $e_{\beta_i} \in E \subset \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} B_\alpha$, hence $f \in \text{span } E$ contradicting that

$E \cup \{f\}$ is a linearly independent set. In summary, the assumption that the Hamel dimension of $F(H)$ is strictly less than $\mathfrak{c}$ led to the existence of this f and hence to this contradiction. So the Hamel dimension of $F(H)$ is precisely $\mathfrak{c}$, and consequently the cardinality $|B(H)| = \mathfrak{c}$. $\square$

An unrelated and interesting question on Hamel bases appears in [1].

Remark 3.3. *The Hamel dimension of every nonzero J -ideal $\mathcal{I}$ is precisely $\mathfrak{c}$. Indeed, $F(H) \subset \mathcal{I}$ (see [8, Section 6, ¶2]) so Proposition 3.2 implies the Hamel dimension of $\mathcal{I}$ is at least $\mathfrak{c}$. Also, since $\mathcal{I} \subset B(H)$ and since cardinality of $B(H)$ is precisely $\mathfrak{c}$, the Hamel dimension of $\mathcal{I}$ is at most $\mathfrak{c}$. Hence the Hamel dimension of $\mathcal{I}$ is precisely $\mathfrak{c}$. Moreover, because $F(H) \subset \mathcal{I} \subset B(H)$, $\mathfrak{c} = |F(H)| \leq |\mathcal{I}| \leq |B(H)| = \mathfrak{c}$ so the cardinality of $\mathcal{I}$ is also precisely $\mathfrak{c}$.*

4. MAIN RESULTS: STRUCTURE AND SOFTNESS

As mentioned earlier in Section 1, one of our main contributions in [8] was the generalization of Fong and Radjavi's result [3, Theorem 2] by showing that the principal J -ideals and the finitely generated J -ideals that are also $B(H)$ -ideals must be J -soft. Here we show the same for J -ideals generated by countable sets and, absent CH, generated by sets of cardinality strictly less than $\mathfrak{c}$. We also show that if a J -ideal $\mathcal{I}$ is generated by sets of cardinality equal to $\mathfrak{c}$, then $\mathcal{I}$ being a $B(H)$ -ideal does not necessarily imply that $\mathcal{I}$ is J -soft (Example 4.5). Our main softness theorem is:

Theorem 4.1. *The J -ideal $(\mathcal{S})_J$ generated by sets $\mathcal{S}$ of cardinality strictly less than $\mathfrak{c}$ is a $B(H)$ -ideal if and only if the $B(H)$ -ideal $(\mathcal{S})$ is J -soft. Moreover, for a J -ideal $\mathcal{I}$ with the Hamel dimension of $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^0$ strictly less than $\mathfrak{c}$, $\mathcal{I}$ is a $B(H)$ -ideal if and only if $(\mathcal{I})$ is J -soft, where $(\mathcal{I})$ is the $B(H)$ -ideal generated by $\mathcal{I}$.*

Proof. $\Rightarrow$: Since $(\mathcal{S})J \subset (\mathcal{S})$, it suffices to show $(\mathcal{S}) \subset (\mathcal{S})J$. Assume otherwise that there is some $T \in (\mathcal{S}) \setminus (\mathcal{S})J$. We claim $(\mathcal{S}) = (\mathcal{S})_J$ so that $T \in (\mathcal{S})_J$. Since every $B(H)$ -ideal is also a J -ideal, $(\mathcal{S})$ is a J -ideal containing $\mathcal{S}$. And $(\mathcal{S})_J$ being the smallest J -ideal containing $\mathcal{S}$, one has $(\mathcal{S})_J \subset (\mathcal{S})$. The minimality of $(\mathcal{S})$ as a $B(H)$ -ideal containing $\mathcal{S}$ and $(\mathcal{S})_J$ assumed to be a $B(H)$ -ideal imply $(\mathcal{S}) \subset (\mathcal{S})_J$. Hence $(\mathcal{S})_J = (\mathcal{S})$ and therefore $T \in (\mathcal{S})_J$ or, equivalently because when $(\mathcal{S})_J = (\mathcal{S})$ it is a $B(H)$ -ideal, one has the equivalent condition $\text{diag } s(T) \in (\mathcal{S})_J$.

Using the s -number sequence $s(T)$ we now construct a sequence of operators D_n as follows. For each $n \geq 1$, let D_n be the diagonal operator with $s_{2^{n-1}(2k-1)}(T)$ at the $2^{n-1}(2k-1)$ scattered diagonal positions for $k \geq 1$ and with zeros elsewhere. Every positive integer has this unique product decomposition $2^{n-1}(2k-1)$. Notice then that the diagonal sequences of the D_n 's have pairwise disjoint support and the formal direct sum $\sum^\oplus D_n$ (which incidentally converges in the operator norm) is precisely $\text{diag } s(T)$. Recall that $(\mathcal{S})_J^0$ is a J -ideal and a complex vector subspace of $(\mathcal{S})_J$ so their quotient $(\mathcal{S})_J/(\mathcal{S})_J^0$ is a vector space. We will use these D_n 's to imbed isomorphic copies of ℓ^p (for every $1 \leq p \leq \infty$) inside the quotient space $(\mathcal{S})_J/(\mathcal{S})_J^0$. (In fact, we imbed isometric isomorphic copies of ℓ^p inside the quotient space $(\mathcal{S})_J/(\mathcal{S})_J^0$.)

We next show that for each $n \geq 1$, $(D_n) = (T)$ and that $D_n \notin (\mathcal{S})_J^0$. Clearly $(D_n) \subset (T)$ since $D_n = PT$ for a suitable diagonal projection operator, so it remains to show $(T) \subset (D_n)$. For each $n \geq 1$, D_n is explicitly given by $\text{diag}(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(2^{n-1}-1)\text{-times}}, s_{2^{n-1}}(T), \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(2^{n-1}-1)\text{-times}}, s_{3 \cdot 2^{n-1}}(T), \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(2^{n-1}-1)\text{-times}}, s_{5 \cdot 2^{n-1}}(T), \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(2^{n-1}-1)\text{-times}}, \dots)$

so the 2^n -fold ampliation of $s(D_n)$ is $(\underbrace{s_{2^{n-1}}(T), \dots, s_{2^{n-1}}(T)}_{2^n\text{-times}}, \underbrace{s_{3 \cdot 2^{n-1}}(T), \dots, s_{3 \cdot 2^{n-1}}(T)}_{2^n\text{-times}}, \dots) \in \Sigma((D_n))$

and since $(s_{2^{n-1}+1}(T), s_{2^{n-1}+2}(T), \dots) \leq (\underbrace{s_{2^{n-1}}(T), \dots, s_{2^{n-1}}(T)}_{2^n\text{-times}}, \underbrace{s_{3 \cdot 2^{n-1}}(T), \dots, s_{3 \cdot 2^{n-1}}(T)}_{2^n\text{-times}}, \dots)$,

so $(s_{2^{n-1}+k}(T))_{k=1}^\infty \in \Sigma((D_n))$ and hence $(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(2^{n-1}-1)\text{-times}}, s_{2^{n-1}+1}(T), s_{2^{n-1}+2}(T), \dots) \in \Sigma((D_n))$.

But also the finitely supported sequence $(s_1(T), s_2(T), \dots, s_{2^{n-1}}(T), 0, \dots) \in \Sigma((D_n))$. Adding both sequences one obtains precisely $s(T)$. Then since $\Sigma((D_n))$ is additive, we have $s(T) \in \Sigma((D_n))$ and hence $\text{diag } s(T) \in (D_n)$. Therefore $(T) \subset (D_n)$, and then from the reverse inclusion above one has $(T) = (D_n)$. To see that $D_n \notin (\mathcal{S})_J^0$, assume otherwise that $D_n \in (\mathcal{S})_J^0$. Then $D_n \in (\mathcal{S})_J^0 \subset (\mathcal{S})J$ so $T \in (D_n) \subset (\mathcal{S})J$ contradicting the assumption $T \in (\mathcal{S}) \setminus (\mathcal{S})J$. So $D_n \notin (\mathcal{S})_J^0$ for all $n \geq 1$. (Other choices of the diagonal sequences for the D_n 's are possible. Besides disjoint supports or "almost" disjoint supports, the only feature needed is bounded gaps between their nonzero entries.)

The set $X_p := \{\sum^\oplus a_i D_i \mid \|\langle a_i \rangle\|_p < \infty, a_i \in \mathbb{C}\} \subset (\mathcal{S})_J$ for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. The inclusion is because the s -number sequence $s(\sum^\oplus a_i D_i) \leq \|\langle a_i \rangle\|_p s(T)$ and because $(\mathcal{S})_J$ contains $\text{diag } s(T)$ and $(\mathcal{S})_J$, being assumed a $B(H)$ -ideal, is hereditary. Clearly X_p , with its canonical vector space structure, is a linear subspace of $(\mathcal{S})_J$. Under the natural projection map, the set of cosets of elements of X_p in the quotient space $(\mathcal{S})_J/(\mathcal{S})_J^0$ is given by the linear subspace $X_p' := \{[\sum^\oplus a_i D_i] \mid \|\langle a_i \rangle\|_p < \infty\}$.

We first show that the map $\sum^\oplus a_i D_i \rightarrow [\sum^\oplus a_i D_i]$ is a one-to-one map, that is, each coset $[\sum^\oplus a_i D_i]$ has a unique element of the form $\sum^\oplus a_i D_i$. Indeed, if $[\sum^\oplus a_i D_i] = [\sum^\oplus a'_i D_i]$, then $[\sum^\oplus (a_i - a'_i) D_i] = [0]$. This implies $\sum^\oplus (a_i - a'_i) D_i \in (\mathcal{S})_J^0 \subset (\mathcal{S})J$. Suppose there exist i_0 such that $a_{i_0} \neq a'_{i_0}$. Since $(\mathcal{S})J$ is a $B(H)$ -ideal, multiplying $\sum^\oplus (a_i - a'_i) D_i$ by a suitable projection it follows that the diagonal operator $(a_{i_0} - a'_{i_0}) D_{i_0} \in (\mathcal{S})J$, and hence $D_{i_0} \in (\mathcal{S})J$. But $(T) = (D_{i_0}) \subset (\mathcal{S})J$ implying $T \in (\mathcal{S})J$, again contradicting $T \in (\mathcal{S}) \setminus (\mathcal{S})J$.

Therefore $a_i = a'_i$ for all $i \geq 1$. So the map $\sum^\oplus a_i D_i \rightarrow [\sum^\oplus a_i D_i]$ is a one-to-one map which is clearly linear, and therefore the map $\langle a_i \rangle \rightarrow [\sum^\oplus a_i D_i]$ is an isomorphism from ℓ^p onto X'_p . (In fact, it is straightforward to show that $\|[\sum^\oplus a_i D_i]\| := \|\langle a_i \rangle\|_p$ is a well-defined complete norm on X'_p which establishes that this linear map is an isometric isomorphism under this induced norm on X'_p , but we will not exploit this isometric property.)

ℓ^p being an infinite-dimensional Banach space over the complex numbers, the cardinality of a Hamel basis for ℓ^p is at least $\mathfrak{c}$ ([4, Lemma 3.4]). Then likewise a Hamel basis $\mathcal{B}'$ for X'_p is at least $\mathfrak{c}$, since isomorphisms preserve Hamel bases. Since X'_p is a vector subspace of $(\mathcal{S})_J/(\mathcal{S})_J^0$, every Hamel basis of a subspace can be extended to a Hamel basis of the full space and because the cardinality of all Hamel bases of a vector space is invariant, it follows that $|\mathcal{B}'| \leq |\mathcal{B}|$ for $\mathcal{B}$ a Hamel basis of $(\mathcal{S})_J/(\mathcal{S})_J^0$. Also since the generating set $\mathcal{S}$ for $(\mathcal{S})_J$ has cardinality strictly less than $\mathfrak{c}$, $|\mathcal{B}| < \mathfrak{c}$ by Proposition 3.1. Therefore $\mathfrak{c} \leq |\mathcal{B}'| \leq |\mathcal{B}| < \mathfrak{c}$, a set theoretic contradiction. To sum up, this contradiction followed from assuming properness of the inclusion $(\mathcal{S})J \subsetneq (\mathcal{S})$. Therefore $(\mathcal{S})J = (\mathcal{S})$, that is, $(\mathcal{S})$ is J -soft.

Next we prove the first implication of the second assertion of this theorem, that is, if $\mathcal{I}$ is a $B(H)$ -ideal, then $(\mathcal{I})$ is J -soft. Following the same method as used above for $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{S})_J$, notice that the contradiction arose from assuming properness of the inclusion $(\mathcal{I})J \subsetneq (\mathcal{I})$, that is, we showed there how the assumption of $(\mathcal{I})J \neq (\mathcal{I})$ led to an imbedding of X'_p (an isometric isomorphic copy of ℓ^p) into $\frac{\mathcal{I}}{\mathcal{I}^0}$ without depending on cardinality of $\mathcal{S}$, and yet still violating $\dim \frac{\mathcal{I}}{\mathcal{I}^0} < \mathfrak{c}$.

$$\Leftarrow: \text{From general ring theory, for } \mathcal{S} = \{S_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}: (\mathcal{S})J = \bigcup_{\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_j\} \subset \mathcal{A}} \{(S_{\alpha_1})J + (S_{\alpha_2})J + \dots + (S_{\alpha_j})J\}$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ is an index set with $|\mathcal{A}| < \mathfrak{c}$. Using the algebraic structure for principal J -ideals implied by Theorem 2.7 (or for principal J -ideals in particular, see also [8, Proposition 4.2]), one obtains $(\mathcal{S})_J = \text{span } \mathcal{S} + (\mathcal{S})_J^0$. Using Remark 2.3 for $(\mathcal{S})_J^0$, one obtains $(\mathcal{S})_J = \text{span } \mathcal{S} + \text{span}\{\mathcal{S}J + J\mathcal{S}\} + J(\mathcal{S})J$. Then $(\mathcal{S}) \subset (\mathcal{S})_J$ because $(\mathcal{S}) = (\mathcal{S})J$ and the commutativity of $B(H)$ -ideal multiplication implies $(\mathcal{S}) = J(\mathcal{S})J$ [2, Sections 2.8, 4.3]. But the minimality of $(\mathcal{S})_J$ as a J -ideal containing $\mathcal{S}$ implies $(\mathcal{S})_J \subset (\mathcal{S})$, and so combining both inclusions, one obtains $(\mathcal{S}) = (\mathcal{S})_J$, that is, $(\mathcal{S})_J$ is a $B(H)$ -ideal.

Finally, we prove the second implication of the second assertion of this theorem, that is, if $(\mathcal{I})$ is J -soft, then $\mathcal{I}$ is a $B(H)$ -ideal. Notice that when $(\mathcal{I})$ is J -soft, one obtains $(\mathcal{I}) = (\mathcal{I})J = J(\mathcal{I})J$, hence $\mathcal{I} \subset J(\mathcal{I})J$. And $J(\mathcal{I})J \subset \mathcal{I}$ because $\mathcal{I}$ is a J -ideal. Combining both inclusions one obtains $\mathcal{I} = J(\mathcal{I})J$ which is a $B(H)$ -ideal. $\square$

Remark 4.2. In Theorem 4.1 only one implication (i.e., $(\mathcal{S})_J$ is a $B(H)$ -ideal $\Rightarrow (\mathcal{S})$ is J -soft) requires the cardinality of $\mathcal{S}$ to be strictly less than the continuum. The reverse implication holds for arbitrary $\mathcal{S}$.

Question 4.3. Is the codimension condition equivalent to the J -ideal $\mathcal{I}$ possessing a generating set of cardinality less than $\mathfrak{c}$. (See also Section 6, Question 5.)

As a consequence of Theorem 4.1 we have

Theorem 4.4. (Structure theorem for $(\mathcal{S})_J$ when $|\mathcal{S}| < \mathfrak{c}$)

The algebraic structure of the J -ideal $(\mathcal{S})_J$ generated by the set $\mathcal{S}$ is given by

$$(\mathcal{S})_J = \text{span}\{\mathcal{S} + J\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{S}J\} + J(\mathcal{S})J$$

$J(\mathcal{S})J$ is a $B(H)$ -ideal, $\text{span}\{J\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{S}J\} + J(\mathcal{S})J$ is a J -ideal, and $J(\mathcal{S})J \subset \text{span}\{J\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{S}J\} + J(\mathcal{S})J \subset (\mathcal{S})_J$. This inclusion collapse to $J(\mathcal{S})J = (\mathcal{S})_J$ if and only if $(\mathcal{S})$ is J -soft.

The fact that the cardinality of every nonzero J -ideal $\mathcal{I}$ is $\mathfrak{c}$ (Remark 3.3) implies that generating sets for $\mathcal{I}$ have at most $\mathfrak{c}$ elements. So in view of Theorem 4.1, the only J -softness cases left to investigate are: if $\mathcal{I}$ cannot be generated by fewer than $\mathfrak{c}$ elements or (possibly more general, see Question 4.3) at least if the Hamel dimension of the quotient space $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^0$ is equal to $\mathfrak{c}$, does either of these imply $\mathcal{I}$ is J -soft? Indeed, we show in Example 4.5 that Theorem 4.1 is the best possible result of its type by giving an example of a J -ideal that is also a $B(H)$ -ideal which is not J -soft. By the contrapositive of Theorem 4.1, this J -ideal has no generating sets of cardinality less than $\mathfrak{c}$ and the Hamel dimension of its quotient $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^0$ is precisely $\mathfrak{c}$.

Example 4.5. Consider $J = K(H)$ and $\mathcal{I} = (\text{diag } \langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle)$ the principal $B(H)$ -ideal generated by the diagonal operator $\text{diag } \langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle$. Since every $B(H)$ -ideal is a J -ideal, $\mathcal{I}$ is also a J -ideal. We will show that the Hamel

dimension of the quotient space $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^0$ is precisely $\mathfrak{c}$, but yet $\mathcal{I}$ is not $K(H)$ -soft. Indeed, $\mathcal{I}^0 = \text{span}\{\mathcal{I}K(H) + K(H)\mathcal{I} + K(H)\mathcal{I}K(H)\}$ and one can show that $\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle \notin \mathcal{I}^0$ [8, Example 3.3]. In the proof of Theorem 4.1 taking $T = \text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle$, imbed X'_p into $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^0$ for any $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. So the Hamel dimension of the quotient space $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^0$ is at least $\mathfrak{c}$. Since $\mathcal{I}$ is a nonzero J -ideal, the Hamel dimension of $\mathcal{I}$ is equal to $\mathfrak{c}$ (Remark 3.3), so the Hamel dimension of the quotient space $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^0$ is at most $\mathfrak{c}$. Therefore the Hamel dimension of $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^0$ is equal to $\mathfrak{c}$. But we know that $(\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle)$ is not $K(H)$ -soft [8, Example 3.3], but for completeness we repeat the proof here. If it were $K(H)$ -soft, then $(\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle) = (\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle)K(H)$ which further implies

$\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle \in \Sigma((\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle)K(H))$, i.e., $\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle = o(D_m \langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle)$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, contradicting $\left(\frac{\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle}{D_m \langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle} \right)_k = \frac{\frac{1}{m+j+r}}{\frac{1}{j+1}} \rightarrow \frac{1}{m}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ where $k = mj + r$.

5. QUESTIONS AND RESULTS ON J -IDEALS

In this section we address some of the questions posed in [8, Sections 6-7] and pose new questions.

The algebraic structure of a principal J -ideal generated by S is $(S)_J = \mathbb{C}S + SJ + JS + J(S)J$. For idempotent $B(H)$ -ideals J (i.e., $J^2 = J$), $J(S)J = SJ + JS + J(S)J$ since $J(S)J = (S)J^2 = (S)J$ and $SJ, JS \subset (S)J = J(S)$. So the algebraic structure of $(S)_J$ simplifies to $(S)_J = \mathbb{C}S + J(S)J$. Is it necessary for J to be idempotent for $J(S)J = SJ + JS + J(S)J$ to hold? (This is related to [8, Remark 6.4, Section 7-Question 6]: Find a necessary and sufficient condition(s) to make $J(S)J = SJ + JS + J(S)J$.) The following example shows that J need not be idempotent for the equality to hold.

Example 5.1. For $0 < p < \infty$, the Schatten p -ideal C_p is not idempotent because $C_p^2 = C_{p/2} \neq C_p$. Moreover, for $S = \text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle \in C_p$ we claim that $C_p(S)C_p = SC_p + C_pS + C_p(S)C_p$ which will follow below from the C_p -softness of (S) . Indeed, for $m > 2$, recall that $(D_m(s(S)))_n = s_{\lceil \frac{n}{m} \rceil}(S)$, so

$$\frac{s_n(S)}{(D_m(s(S)))_n} = \frac{(j+1)^{j+1}}{(mj+r)^{mj+r}} \leq \frac{(2j)^{2j}}{(mj)^{mj}} < \frac{(mj)^{2j}}{(mj)^{mj}} = \frac{1}{m^{(m-2)j} j^{(m-2)j}} \leq \frac{1}{j^j},$$

where $n = mj + r$ and the roof function $\lceil \frac{n}{m} \rceil = j$. By the hereditary property of $\Sigma(C_p)$, $\frac{s(S)}{D_m(s(S))} \in \Sigma(C_p)$ which further implies that $s(S) = \frac{s(S)}{D_m(s(S))} D_m(s(S)) \in \Sigma(C_p(S))$. Hence $(S) = C_p(S)$ which is C_p -softness of (S) , so $(S) = C_p(S)C_p$. Because $C_p^2 \subset C_p$, it follows that $C_pS \subset C_p^2(S)C_p \subset C_p(S)C_p$ and similarly $SC_p \subset C_p(S)C_p$. Therefore $SC_p + C_pS \subset C_p(S)C_p$, hence $C_p(S)C_p = SC_p + C_pS + C_p(S)C_p$.

Finishing this discussion on $JS + SJ + J(S)J$, recall that in the case of a principal J -ideal $(S)_J$, $JS + SJ + J(S)J$ is always a maximal J -ideal in $(S)_J$ [8, Remark 6.3]. The following example gives a partial answer to [8, Section 7, Question 3]: is $JS + SJ + J(S)J$ always a principal J -ideal or is it always a non-principal J -ideal?

Example 5.2. For $J = K(H)$ and $S = \text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle$,

$$JS + SJ + J(S)J = K(H) \text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle + \text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle K(H) + K(H)(\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle)K(H)$$

We claim that this is not a principal $K(H)$ -ideal.

Suppose $JS + SJ + J(S)J = (T)_{K(H)}$. Since $B(H)$ -ideals commute and $K(H)^2 = K(H)$, one has $K(H)(\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle)K(H) = (\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle)K(H)$ and $K(H) \text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle + \text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle K(H) \subset (\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle)K(H)$. Therefore $(T)_{K(H)} = (\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle)K(H)$ hence $(T)_{K(H)}$ is the $B(H)$ -ideal (T) [8, Theorem 2.6, for principal J -ideal see also Theorem 1.2]. Since $T \in (\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle)K(H)$, $s(T) = O(D_m \langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle \rho)$ for some $\rho = \langle \rho_n \rangle \in c_0^*$ [6, Section 1, ¶1], and without loss of generality one can assume $\rho_1 = 1$. Observe that the sequence $\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^l} (D_l(\rho^{1/l})) \in \Sigma(K(H)) = c_0^*$ (the cone of positive sequences decreasing to 0) because it is the c_0 -

norm limit of the sequences $\sum_{l=1}^n \frac{1}{2^l} (D_l(\rho^{1/l}))$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and c_0 (the sequence space of complex numbers

tending to 0) is norm-closed. So in particular, $\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^l} (D_l(\rho^{1/l})) \cdot \left\langle \frac{1}{n} \right\rangle \in \Sigma(K(H)(\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle)) = \Sigma((T))$.

So $\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^l} (D_l(\rho^{1/l})) \cdot \left\langle \frac{1}{n} \right\rangle \in \Sigma((T))$, and expressing this in terms of s -numbers, for some $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $j = kmi + r$ for some i and some $0 \leq r < km$,

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^l} (D_l(\rho^{1/l})) \cdot \left\langle \frac{1}{n} \right\rangle = O(D_k s(T)) = O(D_k (D_m \left\langle \frac{1}{n} \right\rangle \rho)) = O(D_{km} \left\langle \frac{1}{n} \right\rangle D_k(\rho)),$$

thereby contradicting, after setting arbitrary $j = kmi + r$, for some i and $0 \leq r \leq km$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\left\langle \frac{1}{n} \right\rangle \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^l} (D_l(\rho^{1/l}))}{D_{km} \left\langle \frac{1}{n} \right\rangle D_k(\rho)} \right)_j &= \frac{\frac{1}{j} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^l} (D_l(\rho^{1/l}))_j}{(D_{km} \left\langle \frac{1}{n} \right\rangle D_k(\rho))_j} \geq \frac{\frac{1}{j} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^l} (D_l(\rho^{1/l}))_j}{(D_{km} \left\langle \frac{1}{n} \right\rangle D_{km}(\rho))_j} \geq \frac{\frac{1}{j} \frac{1}{2^{km}} (D_{km}(\rho^{\frac{1}{km}}))_j}{(D_{km}(\frac{1}{n}) D_{km}(\rho))_j} = \frac{\frac{1}{(kmi+r)}}{2^{km} \frac{1}{(i+1)} \rho_{i+1}^{1-\frac{1}{km}}} \\ &= \frac{(i+1)}{2^{km} (kmi+r) \rho_{i+1}^{1-\frac{1}{km}}} \text{ which diverges to } \infty \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty \text{ since } km > 1 \text{ and } \rho_i \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

For principal $B(H)$ -ideals (S) , (T) , $(S) = (T)$ if and only if $s(S) = O(D_m s(T))$ and $s(T) = O(D_k s(S))$ for some $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$. When $s(S)$ or $s(T)$ satisfies the $\Delta_{1/2}$ condition, a simpler condition is: $(S) = (T)$ if and only if $s(S) = O(s(T))$ and $s(T) = O(s(S))$. (See [5, Section 2, ¶1].) The following proposition gives a necessary and sufficient condition for two principal J -ideals to be equal [8, Section 7, Question 4]. We hope for a simpler condition.

Proposition 5.3. *For $S, T \in J$,*

$$(S)_J = (T)_J \quad \text{if and only if} \quad aS + bT \in \{SJ + JS + J(S)J\} \cap \{TJ + JT + J(T)J\}$$

for some nonzero $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proof. $\Rightarrow$: Based on the algebraic structure of principal J -ideals implied by Theorem 2.7 (or for principal J -ideals in particular, see also [8, Proposition 2.3]), $(S)_J = (T)_J$ if and only if

$$S = \alpha T + AT + TB + \sum_{i=1}^n A_i T B_i \quad \text{and} \quad T = \beta S + CS + SD + \sum_{j=1}^m C_j S D_j$$

for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}, A, B, C, D, A_i, B_i, C_i, D_i \in J$. If $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$, then substituting S from the first equation in the second equation yields $T \in (T)J$ and then substituting T from the second equation in the first equation yields $S \in (S)J$. Therefore in this case $(T) = J(T)J = (T)_J$ and $(S) = J(S)J = (S)_J$ implied by Theorem 2.6 (or for principal J -ideals in particular, see also [8, Theorem 1.2]). Since $J(S)J = (S)_J = (T)_J = J(T)J$, one has $S, T \in J(S)J \cap J(T)J$, and because $J(S)J \cap J(T)J$ is a J -ideal, $aS + bT \in \{SJ + JS + J(S)J\} \cap \{TJ + JT + J(T)J\}$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$. The cases $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta = 0$ and $\alpha = 0 = \beta$ are handled similarly. Assume finally that $\alpha, \beta \neq 0$. Substituting T from the second equation in the first equation one obtains $S = \alpha\beta S + X$, where $X \in (S)J$. If $\alpha\beta \neq 1$, then $S \in \{SJ + JS + J(S)J\}$, and then, substituting S from the first equation in the second equation, one obtains $T = \alpha\beta T + Y$ where $Y \in (T)J$, so $T \in \{TJ + JT + J(T)J\}$. This implies J -softness of (S) and (T) , hence $J(S)J = (S)_J = (T)_J = J(T)J$ and then as above $aS + bT \in \{SJ + JS + J(S)J\} \cap \{TJ + JT + J(T)J\}$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$. When $\alpha\beta = 1$, $\beta = \frac{1}{\alpha}$, so substituting β in the second equation yields $S - \alpha T = AT + TB + \sum_{i=1}^n A_i T B_i$

and $S - \alpha T = -\alpha(CS + SD + \sum_{j=1}^m C_j S D_j)$. Therefore $S - \alpha T \in \{SJ + JS + J(S)J\} \cap \{TJ + JT + J(T)J\}$ which is the required condition.

$\Leftarrow$: Suppose $aS + bT \in \{SJ + JS + J(S)J\} \cap \{TJ + JT + J(T)J\}$ for some nonzero $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$. Then

$$aS + bT = AT + TB + \sum_{i=1}^n A_i T B_i \quad \text{and} \quad aS + bT = CS + SD + \sum_{j=1}^m C_j S D_j$$

for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}, A, B, C, D, A_i, B_i, C_i, D_i \in J$. From these equalities its clear that $(S)_J = (T)_J$. $\square$

Unlike $B(H)$ -ideals, J -ideals do not necessarily commute as given in the following example.

Example 5.4. Consider $J = K(H)$ and with respect to the standard basis take S to be the diagonal matrix $S := \text{diag}(1, 0, 1/2, 0, 1/3, 0, \dots)$ and T to be the weighted shift with this same weight sequence. We claim $(S)_{K(H)}(T)_{K(H)} \neq (T)_{K(H)}(S)_{K(H)}$. Indeed, suppose $(S)_{K(H)}(T)_{K(H)} = (T)_{K(H)}(S)_{K(H)}$. Then $TS - ST \in (S)K(H)(T) = K(H)(\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n^2} \rangle)$. Since $TS = T$ and $ST = 0$, one has $T \in K(H)(\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n^2} \rangle)$. But $T \in K(H)(\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n^2} \rangle)$ if and only if $\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle \in K(H)(\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n^2} \rangle) \subset K(H)(\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle)$, the latter inclusion contradicts $\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle \notin K(H)(\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle)$ (Example 4.5 or [8, Example 3.3]), so $T \notin K(H)(\text{diag}\langle \frac{1}{n^2} \rangle)$, a contradiction. Therefore $(S)_{K(H)}(T)_{K(H)} \neq (T)_{K(H)}(S)_{K(H)}$.

QUESTIONS

1. Determine which J -ideals have generating sets of cardinality less than $\mathfrak{c}$?
2. Do J -ideals have minimal cardinality generating sets?
3. Traces. $B(H)$ -ideals are important in part because of the importance of their traces, unitarily invariant functionals on $B(H)$ -ideals. Because $B(H)$ -ideals J contain no unitaries this concept does not apply. Is there a modification for which one obtains a useful concept of traces for J -ideals?
4. The study of commutators in $B(H)$ -ideals is directly related to their traces. What can be said about the commutator structure of the J -ideals that can be used to motivate notions of traces for J -ideals?
5. Is the dimension of $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^0$ the cardinality of some generating set for $\mathcal{I}$?
At least if dimension $\mathcal{I}/\mathcal{I}^0 < \mathfrak{c}$, must $\mathcal{I}$ possess a generating set of cardinality less than $\mathfrak{c}$?
(See also Question 4.3.)

REFERENCES

- [1] Blass, Andreas, *Existence of bases implies the axiom of choice*, Amer. Math. Soc., (1984), 31–33.
- [2] Dykema, K., Figiel, T., Weiss, G., and Wodzicki, M., *The commutator structure of operator ideals*, Adv. Math., 185 (1), (2004), 1–79.
- [3] Fong, C.K. and Radjavi, H., *On ideals and Lie Ideals of Compact Operators*, Math. Ann. 262, (1983), 23–28.
- [4] Halbeisen, Lorenz and Hungerbühler, Norbert, *The cardinality of Hamel bases of Banach spaces*, East-West J. Math., (2000) 153–159.
- [5] Kaftal, V and Weiss, G, *$B(H)$ lattices, density and arithmetic mean ideals*, Houston J. Math., (2011), 233–283.
- [6] Kaftal, V. and Weiss, G., *Soft ideals and arithmetic mean ideals*, Integral equations and Operator Theory, (2007), 363–405.
- [7] Mityagin, B.S., *Normed ideals of intermediate type*, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl., (2) 63, (2000), 180–194.
- [8] Patnaik, S and Weiss, G, *Subideals of Operators*, Journal of Operator Theory, to appear.
- [9] Pietsch, Albrecht, *Operator ideals*, North-Holland Mathematical Library, North-Holland Publishing Co., 20 (1980).

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CINCINNATI, OH, 45221-0025, USA
E-mail address: sasmita_19@yahoo.co.in

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CINCINNATI, OH, 45221-0025, USA
E-mail address: gary.weiss@math.uc.edu